

**REMARKS:**

This paper is herewith filed in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on February 22, 2008 for the above-captioned U.S. Patent Application. This office action is a rejection of claims 1-38 of the application.

More specifically, the Examiner has objected to claims 1-38 because of informalities; rejected claims 1, 5, 13-14, 17-18, 21-24, 28, and 33 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention; rejected claims 1, 8, 10, 12-14, 21-22, 24, 26-29, 31, 33, 35, 37, and 38 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Criqui (US20020123344) in view of Corbefin (US6,269,243); rejected claims 2, 5, 7, 15, 18, 30, and 32 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Criqui as modified by Corbefin and in further view of Sinivaara (US6,055,425); rejected claims 3-4 and 16-17 under 35 USC103(a) as being unpatentable over Criqui in view of Corbefin and in further view of Valentine (US6,070,076); rejected claims 6, 19, and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Criqui in view of Corbefin and in further view of Masuda (20010034243); rejected claims 9, 23, and 36 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Criqui as modified by Corbefin and further in view of Derosier (20020016180); and rejected claims 11, 25, and 34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Criqui as modified by Corbefin and further in view of Young. The Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 14, and 29 have been amended for clarification and to further distinguish the claims. Claims 1-38 have been amended to address the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and amended to address the objections because of informalities as indicated by the Examiner. Claim 4 is cancelled. Claims 39-46 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims can be found at least on page 3, lines 7-10, page 7, line 16 to page 8, line 21, and Figs. 1b-1c. No new matter is added.

Regarding the Examiners comments in section 1of the Office Action, as per a telephone conversation with the Examiner on May 20, 2008 this Response is filed without the certified copy of the foreign Application. However, it was agreed that the Applicants representative will subsequently file a certified copy as soon as it is available. The Applicants representative thanks the Examiner for taking the time to discuss this issue.

Regarding the objections to claims 1-38 the Applicants note that claims 1-38 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. The objections are seen as overcome and the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove the objections.

In regards to the rejections of claims 1, 5, 13-14, 17-18, 21-24, 28, and 33 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. The rejections are seen as overcome and the Examiner is respectfully requested to remove the rejections.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) the Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A method, comprising: establishing a satellite connection via a satellite when information transfer between a first network unit and a second network unit is required, releasing to a released state the satellite connection when information transfer between the first network unit and the second network unit is not required, and emulating, without the information transfer between the first network unit and the second network unit, signalling of the second network unit to the first network unit during the released state of the satellite connection.

In the Office Action the Examiner states:

“Criqui et al. do not disclose that emulating of signaling of the first/second network unit for the second/first network unit occurs during a released state of satellite connection. Corbefin et al. disclose emulating of signaling of the first/second network unit for the second/first network unit occurs during a released state of satellite connection (column 2 lines 6-33, column 2 lines 51-64, column 3 line 39- column 4 line 41, where Corbefin et al. disclose matching signals between reception and transmission systems and converting formats

(hence emulating) wherein reception and transmission can be made by satellite or ground/land networks, hence during a released state of satellite connection),”  
(emphasis added).

As cited Corbefin discloses:

“According to the invention, said transponder 4 comprises, as represented in this FIG. 2: a satellite-grade system ER1 for transmitting and receiving electromagnetic waves OE, which is coupled to said antenna 2; a cellular-grade system ER2 for transmitting and receiving electromagnetic waves oe, which is coupled to said antenna 3; a central unit UC which sends, if relevant after matching, signals received by one of said transmission and reception systems ER1 or ER2 to the other system ER2 or ER1; and means of authority 5 for compelling said radiocommunication means R to operate at very reduced power and for controlling the operation thereof,” (emphasis added), (col. 4, lines 17- 32); and

“It will be noted moreover that said central unit UC comprises according to the invention, logic for processing transactions, for converting formats and for managing and controlling the device 1,” (emphasis added), (col. 4, lines 38-41).

Firstly, with regards to the Examiners comments indicating that Corbefin discloses “matching signals,” as stated above, the Applicants note that Corbefin discloses a power auto-matching system built into a radiocommunication device. Corbefin discloses:

“Moreover, advantageously, said means of authority: act, by way of said second transmission and reception system and said second antenna, if relevant on a power auto-matching system built into said radiocommunication means; and/or are built into said central unit, thus making it possible to simplify the device in accordance with the invention,” (col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 4).

The Applicants submit that power auto-matching as in Corbefin is not seen to relate to “emulating” as in claim 1.

Further, the Applicants can not find any further disclosure in Corbefin with relates to “converting formats” as indicated by the Examiner. The Applicants contend that the mere statement of “converting formats and for managing and controlling the device 1,” as cited by the Examiner in Corbefin can not be seen to disclose or suggest “emulating” as in claim 1.

The Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Criqui or Corbefin can there be found any disclosure or suggestion which can be seen to relate to emulating, without information being transferred via a satellite connection between a first network unit and the second network unit during a released state of the satellite connection, a signalling of the second network unit to the first network unit as in claim 1.

Further, the Applicants submit that any combination of the references cited, though not agreed with as proper, still would not disclose or suggest at least where claim 1 recites “emulating, without the information transfer between the first network unit and the second network unit, signalling of the second network unit to the first network unit during a the released state of the satellite connection.” Thus, the rejection of claim 1 should be removed.

In addition, for at least the reasons that independent claims 1, 14, 19, and 39-41 recite language similar to claim 1 as stated above the references cited are not seen to disclose or suggest these claims and the rejections should be removed.

Furthermore, as the claims 2-3 and 5-13, claims 15-28, claims 30-38, and claims 42-46 depend from claims 1, 14, 29, and 41, respectively, the references cited are not seen to disclose or suggest these claims, and all the claims 1-2 and 5-46 should be allowed.

In addition, the Applicants respectfully note that although not all the rejections are argued in this Response the Applicants do not acquiesce to these rejections.


Based on the above explanations and arguments, it is clear that the references cited cannot be seen to disclose or suggest claims 1-2 and 5-46. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of claims 1-2 and 5-46 and to allow all of the pending claims 1-2 and 5-46 as now presented for examination.


For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in

S.N.: 10/561,080  
Art Unit: 2618

the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Should any unresolved issue remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted:

  
John A. Garrity

  
Date

Reg. No.: 60,470

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212


Telephone: (203)925-9400

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: jgarrity@hspatent.com

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

  
Date

  
Name of Person Making Deposit

## ANNOTATED SHEET




FIG. 1a




FIG. 6